

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-2336

MICHAEL MILLARD,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

KENNETH S. APFEL, COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL
SECURITY,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Greenbelt. Jillyn K. Schulze, Magistrate Judge. (CA-
98-3368-MJG)

Submitted: April 28, 2000

Decided: September 18, 2000

Before NIEMEYER, WILLIAMS, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Elliott Denbo Andelman, ANDALMAN & FLYNN, P.C., Silver Spring,
Maryland, for Appellant. Lynne A. Battaglia, United States Attor-
ney, Allen F. Loucks, Assistant United States Attorney, Arthur J.
Fried, General Counsel, Charlotte J. Hardnett, Principal Deputy
General Counsel, James A. Winn, Associate General Counsel, Litiga-
tion Division, Charlotte M. Connery-Aujla, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMIN-
ISTRATION, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Michael Millard appeals from the magistrate judge's order¹ affirming the administrative law judge's decision to deny disability insurance benefits. We have reviewed the briefs and the administrative record, and find that substantial evidence supports the administrative law judge's decision. See Hays v. Sullivan, 907 F.2d 1453, 1456 (4th Cir. 1990). Accordingly, we affirm substantially on the reasoning of the magistrate judge. See Millard v. Apfel, No. CA-98-3368-MJG (D. Md. Jun. 22, 1999).² We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

¹ The parties consented to the jurisdiction of the magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c)(1) (1994).

² Although the magistrate judge's order is dated June 21, 1999, the district court's records show that it was entered on the docket sheet on June 22, 1999. Pursuant to Rules 58 and 79(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it is the date that the order was physically entered on the docket sheet that we take as the effective date of the district court's decision. See Wilson v. Murray, 806 F.2d 1232, 1234-35 (4th Cir. 1986).